

Exhibit 107

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

COORDINATED PROCEEDING SPECIAL)
TITLE (RULE 3.550))

LAOSD ASBESTOS CASES)

J.C.C.P. NO. 4674

TINA HERFORD AND DOUGLAS)
HERFORD,)

CASE NO.
BC646315

PLAINTIFFS,)

vs.)

AT&T CORP., A SUBSIDIARY OF)
AT&T INC. AND ITS SUBSIDIARY)
PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY,)
ET AL.,)

DEFENDANTS.)

DEPOSITION OF MICKEY E. GUNTER, Ph.D.

TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS

AT 875 PERIMETER DR., MCCLURE HALL, ROOM 203,

MOSCOW, IDAHO

SEPTEMBER 8, 2017, AT 10:09 A.M.

REPORTED BY:
MICHAEL S. KUPLACK
CSR 744 (ID), CCR 2750 (WA)
Notary Public

Job No. 2689305

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

MOSHE MAIMON, ESQ. (telephonically)
LEVY KONIGSBERG, LLP
800 Third Avenue, 11th Floor
New York, New York 10022
212-605-6200
mmaimon@levylaw.com

FOR DEFENDANT JOHNSON & JOHNSON:

SHARLA J. FROST, ESQ. (telephonically)
TUCKER ELLIS, LLP
405 Main Street, Suite 500
Houston, Texas 77002
281.657.0730
sharla.frost@tuckerellis.com

FOR DEFENDANTS IMERYS TALC AMERICA AND CYPRUS AMAX
MINERALS COMPANY:

BLAKELEY ORANBURG, ESQ. (telephonically)
DENTONS US, LLP
601 S. Figueroa Street, Ste. 2500
Los Angeles, California 90017
213.243.6103
blakeley.oranburg@dentons.com

FOR DEFENDANTS SHULTON, INC.:

AMY J. TALARICO, ESQ. (telephonically)
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, California 94105
415.442.1227
amy.talarico@morganlewis.com

1	I N D E X	
2	TESTIMONY OF MICKEY E. GUNTER, Ph.D.	PAGE
3	Examination by Mr. Maimon	5
4		
5	DEPOSITION EXHIBITS:	PAGE
6	1 Conference Paper, "Geology of the	41
7	Italian high-quality cosmetic talc from the	
8	Pinerolo district (Western Alps)"	
9	2 Article, "Geology of the Fontane talc	51
10	mineralization (Germanasca valley, Italian	
11	Western Alps); attachment	
12	3 Peretti article, "Geology and Genesis of	53
13	the Talc Deposits in the Pinerolese"	
14	4 Grill article, "A contribution to the study	59
15	of the minerals in the Chissone Valley"	
16	5 Van Gosen, et al, article, "Using the	111
17	geological setting of talc deposits as an	
18	indicator of amphibole asbestos content"	
19	6 York article, "The Mineral History of	118
20	Vermont"	
21	7 Table 23, Chidester report, USGS	121
22	8 Engelhard Technical Service Request,	124
23	Johns-Manville 5/25/73 Report; Bates	
24	BASF-EMCC 00095 through 100	
25	9 Document, 1957, "Vermont Mines and Mineral	132
	Localities, Part I, Southern Vermont," by	
	Morrill and Chaffee	
	10 USGS Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Data,	137
	"Carleton quarry (Chester talc mine) (Record	
	#710) occurrence of asbestos in Windsor	
	cou...."	

(Continued on next page....)

1	DEPOSITION EXHIBITS (Contd.):	PAGE
2		
3	11 Veblen and Burnham article, "New	138
4	biopyriboles from Chester, Vermont:	
5	I. Descriptive mineralogy"	
6		
7	12 Document, "Vermont Due Diligence: Product	139
8	Quality and Quality Control"; Bates	
9	CAMC-Sabatelli-000573 through 600	
10		
11	13 Document, "Schedule 5.16"; Bates	149
12	CAMC-Greco-001021 through 1033	
13		
14	14 USGS Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Data,	154
15	"Reading Talc Mine (MRDS #10081816) TLC"	
16		
17	15 Mindat.org document, "Reading Talc Mine,	155
18	Woodstock, Windsor Co., Vermont, USA"	
19		
20	16 Mindat.org document, "Argonaut Mine	155
21	(Argonaut Talc Mine), Ludlow, Windsor Co.,	
22	Vermont, USA"	
23		
24		
25		

1 THE DEPOSITION OF MICKEY E. GUNTER, Ph.D.,
2 was taken on behalf of the PLAINTIFFS, on SEPTEMBER 8,
3 2017, at UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, 875 PERIMETER DR.,
4 MCCLURE HALL, ROOM 203, MOSCOW, IDAHO, before M & M
5 Court Reporting Services, Inc., by MICHAEL S. KUPLACK,
6 Court Reporter and Notary Public within and for the
7 State of Idaho, to be used in an action pending in the
8 Superior Court of the State of California, County of
9 Los Angeles, said cause being Case No. BC646315 in said
10 Court.

11 AND THEREUPON, the following testimony was
12 adduced, to wit:

13 MICKEY E. GUNTER, Ph.D.,
14 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the
15 whole truth, and nothing but the truth, relating to
16 said cause, deposes and says:

17 EXAMINATION

18 QUESTIONS BY MR. MAIMON:

19 Q. Good morning, Dr. Gunter.

20 A. Good morning, Moshe.

21 Q. My name is Moshe Maimon and I'm here to depose
22 you in the Herford case on behalf of the plaintiff.

23 It's my understanding that you've been retained as an
24 expert in the Herford case. Is that correct?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. And by whom have you been retained?

2 A. Johnson & Johnson.

3 Q. This is a deposition that's taking place
4 telephonically. You're at the University of Idaho in
5 Moscow, Idaho; is that correct?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. You're in McClure Hall, Room 203?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And is anyone there with you aside from the
10 court reporter?

11 A. No, sir.

12 Q. Are you being paid for your time today?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. At what rate?

15 A. \$450 an hour.

16 Q. And is that payment going to go to you
17 personally or does that go to your department at the
18 university?

19 A. It goes to me personally.

20 Q. Is this considered a vacation day for you?

21 A. We don't get vacations. I mean, I'm on a
22 nine-month contract, and academics don't get vacations
23 but we are allowed to do --

24 Q. (Inaudible.)

25 A. I'm sorry.

1 A. Correct. That's what she told me.

2 Q. And --

3 A. And Samples J --

4 Q. Do you know that --

5 A. Go ahead.

6 Q. Do you know that Dr. Blount actually wrote
7 letters to both Luzenac and lawyers for Johnson &
8 Johnson referencing this article and telling them that
9 there was asbestos in Johnson & Johnson talcs?

10 DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL: Objection. Basis, no
11 foundation.

12 A. I've not seen that.

13 Q. (BY MR. MAIMON) The lawyers for Johnson &
14 Johnson didn't give you the letter that Dr. Blount
15 sent to their attorneys, telling them that, quote, "I
16 believe that Johnson & Johnson Vermont talc contains
17 trace amounts of asbestos"?

18 DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL: Objection. Form,
19 foundation.

20 A. Again, I don't recall seeing that.

21 Q. (BY MR. MAIMON) What she describes on
22 page 228 of her article with regard to Sample I would
23 be consistent with asbestos, correct?

24 A. Yes. And samples --

25 Q. (Inaudible.)

1 A. But samples -- Just for the record, samples J
2 through M were also from Windsor Minerals.

3 Q. Yeah, you understand those to be the talc ore
4 from Windsor Minerals, J through M?

5 A. That's what she told me.

6 Q. Okay. And have you seen any documents from
7 Johnson & Johnson which indicate where they -- you
8 know, what they were from, what runs they were from
9 and so forth?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Do you know which deposits among the Windsor
12 mines samples J through M came from?

13 DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL: Objection.
14 Foundation, asked and answered.

15 A. Well, if it was '91 -- Well, again, it would
16 have been before '91. I read somewhere that only the
17 Hammondsville and the Argonaut Mines were cosmetic
18 purposes. But it could have -- it could have been --
19 This could have been Italy, also, but I don't know. I
20 know what she told me.

21 Q. (BY MR. MAIMON) Okay. But you don't know,
22 within the Windsor mines, which particular mine
23 sourced samples J through M, correct?

24 A. Correct.

25 Q. Okay. And so it's true, is it not, that this

1 is a published article which shows asbestos in
2 Johnson & Johnson talc products?

3 DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL: Objection. Form.

4 A. In that one particular sample.

5 Q. (BY MR. MAIMON) Yes?

6 A. Yes.

7 DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL: Same objection.

8 A. In that one --

9 Q. (BY MR. MAIMON) Okay. You also mentioned
10 earlier, one of the first things, that you have
11 Dr. Longo's report in this matter, correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And I'd like to know, similar to the questions
14 that I asked you about Dr. Compton's report, do you
15 have any criticism of the methodology that Dr. Longo
16 utilized as described in his expert report?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Can you tell me what your criticisms are?

19 A. The main one is that he used -- did a heavy
20 liquid separation and he used a density of 2.85; and
21 based upon that, he then said that no anthophyllite
22 would appear in the heavy portion because iron-free
23 anthophyllite would have a density similar to 2.85. I
24 disagree with that and -- because the density that I
25 calculated for an iron-free anthophyllite is 3.02 and

1 another anthophyllite sample I had was 3.08. So, my
2 biggest criticism --

3 Q. What were those densities, 3.02 and 3.08?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Go ahead.

6 A. My biggest criticism would be his assumption
7 that none of the anthophyllite would be in the heavy
8 portion based on the densities in anthophyllite. And
9 also he found -- He has talc, which has a lower
10 density, in some of his data.

11 So, that would be the biggest -- sorry, the
12 biggest criticism.

13 Q. Okay. So, I'm talking about the -- maybe
14 something different, and I'm sorry if you didn't
15 understand. The method that he used, I'm not talking
16 about his interpretation of the results or his
17 assumptions. I understand that you have a -- that you
18 disagree with his assumption that iron-free
19 anthophyllite would have a density of 2.85 and
20 therefore would not be revealed as present through
21 this testing, correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. The testing that he says that he did is
24 testing that would show tremolite, correct?

25 A. That's what he states, yes.

1 Q. He bases this on the work of Dr. Blount,
2 correct?

3 A. He bases the density separation, but then not
4 the -- He uses an AHERA interpretation of a fiber and
5 not Alice's interpretation of fibers and needles. So,
6 he uses a different interpretation of what would be
7 asbestos and what wouldn't be than Alice did.

8 Q. Okay. So, he performed a specific analysis,
9 correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And then he got data from that analysis and he
12 interpreted it a certain way, correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And one of the interpretations that he made
15 was his counting, the way he counted the fibers or
16 particles that he included in his report, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And then another interpretation that he made
19 was the -- where -- or what the density would be for
20 iron-free anthophyllite, correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And you disagree with both of those, correct?

23 A. They're wrong.

24 Q. The choice of the analysis, by separating the
25 heavier particles by the high density, is that, in

1 your mind, an invalid methodology?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Okay. You have a disagreement with Dr. Longo
4 as to what the density would be for iron-free
5 anthophyllite, correct?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. His identification of tremolite, do you take
8 issue with that?

9 A. Some of these could be tremolite to tremolite
10 slash actinolite based on the iron content, but
11 nothing significant, no.

12 Q. Okay. So, you don't take issue with his
13 identification, mineralogical identification, of the
14 tremolite, correct?

15 A. The tremolite and actinolite, correct.

16 Q. Okay. I take it that you do take issue with
17 his choice to count certain particles as asbestos,
18 correct?

19 A. Well, again, he's saying he uses Blount's
20 method, but then he doesn't use the same counting
21 criteria she did. And he's using the AHERA air method
22 for his counting rules and not a bulk method, so....

23 Q. So, if you take a look, he describes using the
24 Blount talc density heavy liquid preparation method,
25 correct?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And he did that, correct?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Dr. Blount counted -- based on aspect ratios
5 and for greater than 15 to 1, she counted those as
6 fibers, and you agreed that those showed asbestos,
7 correct?

8 A. Not necessarily. I mean, I have seen single
9 particles of anthophyllite from the Vanderbilt
10 deposit, and other places, that could have very high
11 aspect ratios and not be -- not be from an asbestiform
12 sample.

13 Q. I understand that you've done that in other
14 circumstances, but you agreed with me that
15 Dr. Blount's characterization of Sample I would be
16 consistent with asbestos in the sample, correct?

17 A. It would be consistent with, again, the
18 counting criteria and those sorts of things, yes.

19 Q. So, Dr. Longo, he used her method of sample
20 preparation by heavy liquid, correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And do you have any criticism of how he did
23 the preparation by the density heavy liquid method?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Okay. He then identified by TEM the particles

1 Q. (BY MR. MAIMON) Dr. Gunter, are you still
2 there?

3 A. No. Yes, yes.

4 Q. I've got one more question, and hopefully it's
5 only one. Have you ever analyzed a sample of cosmetic
6 talc and determined that it had asbestos in it?

7 A. No.

8 MR. MAIMON: That's all I have.

9 (The deposition concluded at 3:14 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF WITNESS

I, MICKEY E. GUNTER, Ph.D., being first duly sworn, depose and say:

That I am the witness named in the foregoing deposition consisting of pages 1 through 169; that I have read said deposition and know the contents thereof; that the questions contained therein were propounded to me; and that the answers therein contained are true and correct except for any changes that I may have listed on the Change Sheet attached hereto.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2017.

MICKEY E. GUNTER, Ph.D.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this ____ day of _____, 2017.

NAME OF NOTARY PUBLIC

NOTARY PUBLIC FOR _____

RESIDING AT _____

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES _____

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, MICHAEL S. KUPLACK, Certified Shorthand
Reporter, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken
before me at the time and place therein set forth, at
which time any witnesses were placed under oath;

That the testimony and all objections made
were recorded stenographically by me and were
thereafter transcribed by me or under my direction;

That the foregoing is a true and correct
record of all testimony given, to the best of my
ability;

That I am not a relative or employee of any
attorney or of any of the parties, nor am I financially
interested in the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and seal September 15, 2017.



Michael S. Kuplack
MICHAEL S. KUPLACK, ID CSR NO. 744
Notary Public

My Commission Expires August 13, 2019.